

24th August 1925]

A.—(a) It is proposed to move for supplementary grants for the following amounts for the various departments :—

	RS.
(1) Agriculture ... ..	1,67,825
(2) Industries ... ..	1,63,640
(3) Fisheries ... ..	44,300
(4) Co-operation ... ..	10,185
(5) Veterinary ... ..	8,935
(6) Weights and measures ... ..	1,300

(b) No.

(c) Dispensaries have been sanctioned at Krishnagiri in Salem, Gobichettipalayam in Coimbatore and Harpanahalli in Bellary. It is proposed to open three more at Kavali, Conjeeveram and Karur during 1925-26. Touring posts have been sanctioned at Namakkal, Chandragiri and Hosur and three more are proposed for Podili in Nellore, Pollachi in Coimbatore and Pithapuram in Godavari in the current year.

(d) Fresh recruits will be necessary when the three new dispensaries and the three touring billets referred to in clause (c) are sanctioned.

[Note.—An asterisk (\*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

\* The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ May I ask, Sir, why so few questions have been answered to-day? Is it because all the questions have been exhausted, or because the Government have not sent in their answers to the Council Office?”

\* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ All the questions for which answers have been received have been put in the answer papers.”

\* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Government, after sending an answer to the Council Office, can withdraw that answer at any stage?”

\* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ If the Government have no objection, Sir, we shall proceed with the unstarred questions and ask supplementary questions on them.” (Laughter).

\* The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ With regard to the question of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, I suppose the Government can correct themselves as anyone else, whenever they find that they have made mistakes; and we should raise no objection to that. They need not stick to their mistakes or to any ‘prestige’.”

\* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—“ Is there no limit of time within which they can withdraw or correct or alter or modify their answers?”

## II

### DISCUSSION ON QUESTION No. 280A REGARDING THE ALLEGED ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE BY AN M.L.C.

\* Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ Mr. Deputy President, Sir, on Friday, regarding my question No. 280A, it was enquired whether I took sufficient precautions and made sufficient enquiries so as to have any foundation for my putting that question. I requested the hon. the President to

[24th August 1925]

**Registration.***Stamp fees for returning documents presented for registration.*

359 Q.—Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether payment of annas five is insisted upon for every document presented for registration for returning the same by post;

(b) what portion of the five annas is actually spent on (i) postage, (ii) envelope;

(c) whether Sub-Registrars are utilizing any portion from the deposit of five annas for purchase of stamps for their office use than for the return of documents;

(d) whether he is aware that in a majority of offices the sum of annas five is demanded as if that sum was included in the registration fees;

(e) what is the total amount of money received during the year 1924-25 for return of documents and how much of that money has been actually spent on postage and how the balance has been utilized; and

(f) in view of the fact that five annas is not required in a majority of cases for transmission of documents by post whether he will be pleased to consider the advisability of reducing the postal fee deposit?

A.—(a) Yes if the presentant desires the return of the document by post.

(b) The amounts vary with the size and weight of each document sought to be returned by post. The minimum postage including registration and acknowledgment fees is four annas and the cost of each envelope is about one pie.

(c) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (3) of question No. 914 answered at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 15th October 1924.

(d) No.

(e) Information has been called for.

(f) The question is already under the consideration of the Government.

**Development Department.**

*Allotment out of the remission of Provincial contributions to Department: under the hon. Development Minister.*

360 Q.—Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) what amount was allotted for each of the departments under his control out of the remission of Provincial contribution;

(b) whether any amount has been set apart for the improvement of the status and the increment of the salaries and grades of the veterinary assistant surgeons;

(c) whether any new dispensaries and touring billets have been started or are under contemplation, and if so at what centres; and

(d) whether any fresh recruitment of veterinary assistant surgeons has been contemplated, and if not, why not?